REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 15-16 were rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by Haynes. Independent Claim 1 has been amended to further recite that the anchor includes a top wall substantially closing the interior volume at its upper end, while being provided with a fluid connection to the interior volume to cause fluid to be withdrawn away from an upper part of the interior volume during embedment, and whereby suction is applied to cause embedment of the anchor in seabed soil.

Haynes is deficient at least with respect to disclosing the presently claimed top wall as well as the fluid connection to cause fluid to be withdrawn away from the upper part of the interior volume. For the embodiments of Figures 1 and 2 in Haynes, it is clear that these embodiments have no top wall and on the contrary, the upper ends of the casings are open. Furthermore, there is no fluid connection that causes fluid to be withdrawn away from the upper part of the interior volume. Rather, it is noted that one-way valves 18 are the only structure shown causing any type of fluid movement near the upper portions of the casings. As explained with respect to Figure 1, material is squeezed through one-way valve 18 into the upper cavity 24, but the fluid is not withdrawn away from the upper part of the interior volume. Because of this clear lack of corresponding structure in Haynes, Figures 1 and 2 cannot anticipate the present invention. With respect to the embodiment shown in Figure 3 of Haynes, a cluster pile platform 33 is shown wherein a pump assembly 35 is attached to the top of a pile 37. The pile 37 is simply a cylindrical tube. Even if the pump 35 is construed to correspond to the claimed top wall, this embodiment has no means for retaining seabed soil. Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion within this reference that the various components of the embodiments should be substituted in other embodiments.

With respect to the other embodiments shown in Haynes (Figures 4, 5, and 6a – 6c), these embodiments also fail to anticipate the invention as now claimed in each of the independent claims. Figures 4 and 5 show special applications of the anchor, but no further structural details beyond what is disclosed in Figures 1-3. Figures 6a-6c show the manner in which the anchors are to be driven under the seabed floor. As shown, the anchor will deviate from the vertical because of drag produced by the lift line guides 65 and the padeye 66. It is clear from Figures 6a

– 6c that prior to a load being applied, the presence of the wall 4 plays little or no part in increasing the resistance to an upward pull considering the adjacent end of the pile has no top or closure element. Thus, there is simply no motivation to add a top wall to what is shown in Haynes.

There is also no teaching or suggestion that discrete components of the various embodiments can be substituted in other embodiments. For example, there is no teaching or suggestion that the deficiencies in the embodiment Figure 3 (lack of any means for retaining seabed soil) should be remedied by adding an interior wall/bulk head 4 like the embodiment of Figure 1.

Independent method Claim 8 has been amended similar to Independent Claim1 to require a top wall and fluid connection. Furthermore, Claim 8 also requires force to be generated by applying suction to the interior volume of the anchor. As mentioned above with respect to the embodiments of Figures 1 and 2, since there is no top wall in these embodiments, suction cannot be applied to the interior volume of the anchor to achieve any relevant purpose.

Independent Claims 15 and 16 haves also been amended similar to Claims 1 and 8 by further requiring the top wall, as well suction being applied to cause embedment of the seabed anchors. Thus, for the same reasons set forth above with respect to Claims 1 and 8, Claims 15 and 16 also distinguish over the Haynes reference. Accordingly, the rejection under Section 102 should be withdrawn.

The application now appearing to be in form for allowance, early notification of same is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if doing so would expedite the resolution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By: s/Brent P. Johnson

Brent P. Johnson
Registration No. 38,031
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200
Denver, Colorado 80202-5141
(303) 863-9700

Date: May 29,2007